REMARKS

Claims 1 and 9-44 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 10, 18-22 and 24-26 are amended; claims 2-8 are canceled; and claims 27-44 are added. No new matter is added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nguyen in the March 23 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Information Disclosure Statement

An Information Disclosure Statement with Form PTO-1449 was filed in the above-captioned patent application on June 18, 2001. Applicant has not yet received from the Examiner a copy of the Form PTO-1449 initialed to acknowledge the fact that the Examiner has considered the disclosed information. The Examiner is requested to initial and return to the undersigned a copy of the Form PTO-1449. For the convenience of the Examiner, a copy of that form is attached.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-23, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,815,136 to Ikeda et al. ("Ikeda") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,025,822 to Motegi et al. ("Motegi"); claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ikeda in view of Motegi; and claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ikeda in view of Motegi and U.S. Patent No. 5,761,694 to Rao. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Ikeda does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 27, 37 and 38. Claim 1 recites "a memory having a plurality of memory cells that are capable of storing an image signal for performing display control of dots in at least one row of said display section, the plurality of memory cells being arranged in a matrix having a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns;" claim 27 recites " a memory cell section having a plurality

of memory cells, the plurality of memory cells being arranged in a matrix having a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns;" claim 37 recites "a memory cell section having a plurality of memory cells, the plurality of memory cells being arranged in a matrix having a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns, a length of the matrix in a row direction that intersects a column direction along which the plurality of data lines extend being shorter than a length of the display section in the row direction;" and claim 38 recites "a memory cell section having a plurality of memory cells, a length of the memory cell section in a row direction that intersects a column direction along which the plurality of data lines extend being shorter than a length of the display section in the row direction."

Regarding claims 1 and 27, Ikeda does not teach a plurality of memory cells arranged in a matrix, as recited above. Motegi and Rao do not cure the deficiencies of Ikeda.

Regarding claims 37 and 38, claim 37 recites that the plurality of memory cells are arranged in a matrix such that the length of the matrix is shorter than the length of the display section in the row direction, and claim 38 recites a memory cell section having a length shorter than a length of the display section in the row direction. Ikeda does not teach either of the recited features. Motegi and Rao do not cure the deficiencies of Ikeda.

The Office Action, at page 2, asserts that Ikeda teaches "a memory (2425) having a plurality of memory cells that are capable of storing an image signal." Notwithstanding these assertions, Ikeda does not disclose or suggest the recited memory cell arrangement in a matrix disposed between the display section and the selection switch, the three sections being formed on one substrate.

The memory cell of Ikeda is clearly shown in Fig. 47A separate from the liquid crystal panel. Motegi shows, in Fig. 1, a memory unit 10 having a (64 x 3 x 480) capacity, but the memory unit is disposed before the arithmetic circuit and shown separated as a column driver in Fig. 1. Likewise, Rao merely discloses multiple memory banks each having an array of

memory cells (Abstract). Ikeda, Motegi and Rao do not teach or suggest the memory arrangements, as recited in claims 1, 27, 37 and 38.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 27, 37 and 38 are patentable over the applied references. The dependent claims are likewise patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 9-44 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Richard J. Kim
Registration No. 48,360

JAO:RJK/al

Attachment:
Form PTO-1449 dated June 18, 2001

Date: June 30, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461